

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

VOL. XIV, NO. 363

JUNE 16, 1946

RECEIVED FROM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

"Random Harvest"

Address by UNDER SECRETARY ACHESON page 1045

Proposals for Amendment of ILO Constitution

Article by BERNARD WIESMAN page 1028

German Documents on Relations With Japan page 1038

The Paris Agreement on Reparation From Germany

Article by JOHN B. HOWARD page 1023

Selective Service Processing of American Citizens

Outside the U. S. page 1035

For complete contents
see inside cover



THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

BULLETIN

VOL. XIV • No. 363 •



• PUBLICATION 2552

June 16, 1946

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U. S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D. C.

SUBSCRIPTION:

52 issues, \$3.50; single copy, 10 cents

Special offer: 13 weeks for \$1.00
(renewable only on yearly basis)

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication compiled and edited in the Division of Research and Publication, Office of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes press releases on foreign policy issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest is included.

Publications of the Department, cumulative lists of which are published at the end of each quarter, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.

Contents

Economic Affairs	Page
The Paris Agreement on Reparation From Germany	
Article by John B. Howard	1023
Proposals for Amendment of ILO Constitution	
Article by Bernard Wiesman	1028
Election of Bank and Fund Officials	1044
The Proclaimed List	1052
Signing of Protocol Modifying the Income-Tax Convention With the United Kingdom	1052
General Policy	
"Random Harvest"	
By Under Secretary Acheson	1045
Rumanian Reply to U.S. Note on General Elections and Public Liberties	1048
Mission To Observe Revision of Greek Electoral Lists	1050
Letters of Credence:	
Ambassador of the U.S.S.R.	1050
Ambassador of Haiti	1050
Ambassador of Great Britain	1050
Philippine Independence Day Ceremonies	1051
Occupation Matters	
Far Eastern Commission	1042
Policy Statement Regarding Aliens in Japan	1042
German Documents	
German Documents on Relations With Japan	1038
The United Nations	
Representative on Commission on Narcotic Drugs	1052
Treaty Information	
The Paris Agreement on Reparation From Germany	
Article by John B. Howard	1023
Treaty Obligations and Philippine Independence:	
Exchange of Notes between the U.S. and Bolivian Gov- ernment	1049
Signing of Military Mission Agreement With Venezuela	1050
Transit Use of Azores Airports	1051
Signing of Protocol Modifying the Income-Tax Convention With the United Kingdom	1052
International Organizations and Conferences	
Calendar of Meetings	1042
Activities and Developments	1042
Cultural Cooperation	
Visit of Haitian Economist	1053
Visit of Chinese Scientist	1053
The Department	
Resignation of George P. Baker	1054
Appointment of Officers	1054
The Congress	1053
The Foreign Service	
Selective Service Processing of American Citizens Outside the U.S.	1035
Confirmations	1053
Consular Offices	1053
Training Announcements	1054

The Paris Agreement on Reparation From Germany

Article by JOHN B. HOWARD¹

THE EIGHTEEN-POWER Paris Conference on Reparation was in session from November 9 to December 21, 1945. It was convened upon the invitation of the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France, as the powers occupying the three western zones of Germany. The other participating countries were Albania, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, Greece, India, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Union of South Africa, and Yugoslavia. James W. Angell, United States representative on the Allied Commission on Reparation—Germany, was the Delegate of the United States at the Conference. D. Maynard Phelps, deputy United States representative on the Allied Commission was Deputy Delegate.

The Paris Conference recommended to the participating governments the adoption of the Paris Agreement on Reparation.² This agreement was signed on January 14, 1946 by a sufficient number of governments to bring it into force on that date and has now been signed by all of the 18 governments which participated in the Paris Conference.

I

The basic program of the United States and its Allies for the satisfaction of their reparation claims against defeated Germany is contained in two complementary agreements—the tripartite Potsdam Agreement³ of August 2, 1945 and the 18-power Paris Agreement on Reparation of January 14, 1946 resulting from the Paris Conference on Reparation.

At the Potsdam Conference the Governments of the United States, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United Kingdom agreed upon the principles of a plan for the exaction of reparation which formed an integral part of a coordinated Allied political and economic policy toward Germany. The World War I con-

ception of reparation as the maximum obtainable financial compensation in fixed sums of money for the staggering costs of war to the Allies was abandoned. The application of this conception had actually transferred much of the real burden of German reparation to the Allies, in the form of repudiated loans. Instead, the Potsdam Agreement established two major new principles. First, it was agreed that the primary objective should be the establishment of military and economic security against renewed German aggression, not the maximizing of reparation receipts. Second, it was agreed that reparation should be paid by Germany in kind, rather than in cash, the payment in kind to be made out of such German assets as would, if left under German control, constitute an economic base for future aggression by Germany but would, if received as reparation, hasten the economic recovery of the United Nations. The total amount and duration of reparation and, to some extent, the character of the reparation assets to be made available by Germany were not fixed in advance but were made dependent upon subsequent determinations to be reached by the Control Council for Germany with respect to the establishment of the German economy on a peaceful basis.

Agreement was also reached at Potsdam upon a plan for the division of German reparation assets between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Poland, on the one hand, and the United States, the United Kingdom, and other countries entitled to reparation, on the other hand. Under this plan and subsequent decisions the principal

¹ Special Adviser to James W. Angell, U. S. representative on the Allied Commission on Reparations for Germany and U. S. Delegate to the Paris Conference on Reparation. Mr. Howard also acted subsequently as alternate to the U. S. Delegate to the Inter-Allied Reparation Agency.

² For text of the Paris Agreement on Reparation, see BULLETIN of Jan. 27, 1946, p. 114.

³ For text of the Potsdam Agreement, see BULLETIN of Aug. 5, 1945, p. 153.

assets out of which the reparation claims of the countries in the latter group are to be satisfied include:

1. German enemy assets within the jurisdiction of these countries.
2. German external assets within the countries which remained neutral in the war against Germany.
3. 75 percent of the industrial capital equipment to be removed from the western zones of Germany.⁴
4. Two thirds of the German merchant marine.⁵
5. The commodities to be delivered by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (referred to hereafter as Russian reciprocal deliveries) in exchange for receipt of 15 percent of the industrial capital equipment to be removed from the western zones of Germany.⁶

At the Paris Conference on Reparation the governing principles and the mechanism were established for the division of these reparation assets among the 18 governments which participated in

the conference. Arrangements are under consideration whereby certain other governments which are entitled to receive reparation from Germany and which did not participate in the conference will meet their reparation claims from German external assets within their several jurisdictions.

II

Several major results were achieved by the Paris Conference and by the Paris Agreement:

1. Agreement was reached among the 18 governments on their respective shares in all assets available to these governments collectively as reparation from Germany.

In the establishment of reparation shares the Paris Conference was guided by the principle, agreed upon at the Yalta Conference of February 1945,⁷ that reparation from Germany should be received in the first instance by those countries which have borne the main burden of the war, have suffered the heaviest losses, and have organized victory over the enemy. To insure the attainment of an equitable distribution of reparation assets in the light of this principle, the conference examined extensive data submitted by the participating governments relating to their reparation claims against Germany. The data covered a number of categories such as war damage, war expenditures, costs of German occupation, man-years spent in the armed forces and war production, and loss of life. The sum total of claims for direct damage, war expenditures, and occupation costs alone amounted to almost \$300 billion, an amount obviously tremendously in excess of the total value of any probable available German reparation assets.

This statistical data necessarily provided much of the basis for determining the relative sizes of the reparation shares of the several countries. Nevertheless, it was clear to the delegates to the conference that no single formula could be devised which would adequately take into account the statistical non-comparability of the different categories of losses and the numerous non-statistical factors inherent in the Yalta principle for the equitable division of reparation assets.

The reparation shares agreed upon assign separate percentage shares to each government in two different categories of reparation assets.⁸ One category, designated A, includes all reparation

⁴ Of the 25 percent which is to be allocated to the U.S.S.R. and Poland, 10 percent represents reparation to these countries and 15 percent is to be paid for by the U.S.S.R. in food, raw materials, and other products.

⁵ The Potsdam Agreement provided for equal distribution of the surrendered German merchant marine among the U.S.S.R., United States, and United Kingdom. It provided further that the U.S.S.R. would provide out of its share for Poland and that the United States and United Kingdom would provide, from their shares, appropriate amounts for other Allied countries whose merchant marines have suffered heavy losses in the war against Germany. The ships allocated to the United States and United Kingdom, in accordance with their respective one-third shares, have been made available by these countries to the Inter-Allied Reparation Agency, referred to below, for distribution by the Agency among the 18 member governments in accordance with the principles of allocation established in the Paris Agreement.

⁶ Although the Potsdam Agreement does not expressly so provide, it has been decided that Russian reciprocal deliveries should constitute a source of reparation to the countries other than U.S.S.R. and Poland.

⁷ For text of the report on the Crimea (Yalta) Conference, see BULLETIN of Feb. 18, 1945, p. 213.

⁸ Reparation assets were divided into two categories because of the decision of the United States, discussed below, not to claim so large a share of industrial equipment as of other forms of reparation assets and because of the greater administrative convenience of allocating individual items of reparation in accordance with separate shares for these two categories.

assets⁹ except industrial and other capital equipment removed from Germany and merchant ships and inland water transport. The latter types of assets comprise the other category, designated B. These percentage shares for the 18 governments are as follows:

Table of Shares

Country	Percentage share	
	Category A	Category B
Albania	0.05	0.35
United States of America	28.00	11.80
Australia	0.70	0.95
Belgium	2.70	4.50
Canada	3.50	1.50
Denmark	0.25	0.35
Egypt	0.05	0.20
France	16.00	22.80
United Kingdom	28.00	27.80
Greece	2.70	4.35
India	2.00	2.90
Luxembourg	0.15	0.40
Norway	1.30	1.90
New Zealand	0.40	0.60
Netherlands	3.90	5.60
Czechoslovakia	3.00	4.30
Union of South Africa	0.70	0.10
Yugoslavia	6.60	9.60
	100.00	100.00

The reparation receipts to which the United States is entitled, as a consequence of its percentage shares as shown above and of the special provisions of the Paris Agreement applying to German external assets and to receipts of German merchant ships, may be summarized as follows:¹⁰

(a) All German external assets within the jurisdiction of the United States, estimated at some \$200 million;

(b) 28 percent of German external assets in neutral countries;

(c) A share of German merchant shipping proportionate to the relative tonnage losses of the United States;¹¹

(d) 11.8 percent of industrial and other capital equipment removed from the western zones of Germany and made available to the governments participating in the Paris Conference; and

(e) 28 percent of the value of all other German assets made available for reparation to these governments, including such assets as Russian reciprocal deliveries.

At the Paris Conference the United States did not claim so large a percentage share of industrial equipment as of other types of reparation assets. This decision was based on the fact that the early receipt of such equipment is especially important to the war-devastated countries of Europe, whereas the United States, as a capital exporting

nation, has only a limited interest in such equipment. The share of the United States is large enough to cover equipment which may be removed from Germany as reparation in which there are private American pre-war financial interests of a substantial character,¹² and also to make possible the receipt of a relatively small volume of special items likely to be desired by the United States and its nationals. Canada and the Union of South Africa likewise decided at the Paris Conference not to claim so large a share of industrial equipment as of other types of reparation assets. It is quite likely, in view of the restricted class of German industrial equipment and of German merchant ships which the United States will wish to receive as reparation, that the United States will not submit requests to IARA to the full extent of its share of these items.

⁹ The Potsdam Agreement does not determine whether current production and labor shall be regarded as sources of reparation. The agreement does provide, however, that the proceeds of exports from current production and stocks shall be available in the first place for payment for imports. The reparation shares assigned at the Paris Conference have been adjusted in recognition of the benefits accruing from past use and the then anticipated future use by the participating governments of German prisoner-of-war labor.

¹⁰ In order that countries, such as the United States and Canada, which decided not to claim so large a share of industrial equipment as of other forms of reparation assets, should not be penalized in their receipt of other assets as the result of these decisions, section G of article 1 of part I of the Paris Agreement was adopted. Under this section such a country, in accounting for receipts of merchant ships and of German external assets within its jurisdiction, is entitled to regard its Category B percentage share of ships as equal to its larger Category A percentage share and to charge off excess external assets (as provided in section E of the same article) against the additional share to which the country would have been entitled if its share in Category B were equal to its Category A percentage share. The statements in paragraphs a and c in the text are based on the United States percentage of losses of ships and on a reasonable assumption regarding the minimum total value of industrial equipment removals envisaged by the Potsdam Agreement. Paragraph b results from section C of article 1, part I, of the Paris Agreement.

¹¹ The Paris Agreement provides that the German merchant ships available as reparation to the signatory governments shall be distributed among them in proportion to the respective over-all losses of merchant shipping, on a gross-tonnage basis, of the signatory governments and their nationals through acts of war.

¹² See the allocation principle discussed below, which gives priority to a claimant country having a substantial interest in industrial equipment removed from Germany.

In order to insure an equitable distribution of individual items of industrial equipment among the several governments, within the limits of their respective reparation shares, and to promote the effective use of industrial equipment for reconstruction purposes, the Paris Conference adopted certain general principles to govern the allocation of industrial equipment as reparation. One is that no government shall request allocation to it of industrial equipment except for use in its own territory or for use by its own nationals outside its own territory. A second principle adopted is that items of industrial equipment in which a country has a substantial pre-war financial interest shall be allocated to that country if it so desires.¹³ Under these principles, a property may not be requested merely for resale to another country; and if a property is removed from Germany in which a substantial American interest existed, that property will be allocated to the United States upon its request, regardless of competing claimants, and may be relocated in western Europe or elsewhere under American ownership. The allocation of an item of industrial equipment between two or more countries having substantial interests in the item, or between claimant countries none of which has such an interest, is to be guided by certain general criteria such as the urgency of need for economic rehabilitation, the extent of loss of similar property, the relation of the item to the claimant country's pre-war economy and post-war development, requirements of countries with small shares for specific items, and the maintenance of a reasonable balance among the rates at which the reparation shares of the several claimant governments are satisfied.

It is worth noting that although the reparation shares assigned by the Paris Agreement are based in part on a consideration of private losses resulting from war damage to property, as well as of in part on a consideration of private losses of a public or general character, the allocation of German assets as reparation is made, not to the individual persons who suffered losses, but to the several governments involved. The compensation of private persons who hold claims against Ger-

many arising out of the war is a matter for the several Allied governments, to be handled in accordance with their respective governmental procedures. It should also be noted that the reparation mechanism is independent of the procedures which have been agreed upon for the restoration, by way of restitution, of property which was looted by Germany and subsequently recovered and identified.

2. Agreement was reached by the governments participating in the Paris Conference that their respective shares of reparations shall be regarded by each of them as covering all its claims and those of its nationals against the former German Government and its agencies arising out of the war. By virtue of this agreement the several governments undertook not to present reparation claims against Germany for satisfaction outside the framework of the reparation program envisaged under the Potsdam Agreement. This undertaking was without prejudice to the final determination of the total amount of reparation and the right each government may have in the final settlement of German reparation, which may become the subject of negotiations at the peace settlement with Germany.

3. The Paris Agreement also established the principle that no signatory government shall assert or support claims against any other signatory government or its nationals in respect of property received by that government as reparation. Accordingly, where a signatory government receives property in which other signatory governments or their nationals have financial interests, the latter governments will not support any claims of their nationals, and will not assert any claims of their own, against the receiving government or its nationals. The giving of clear title to reparation assets received, to which this principle contributes, is desirable in order to help avoid years of complex litigation over such property in the courts of the recipient countries involving the nationals of other countries. Such litigation would engender friction, and the possible later assertion of claims against property removed might impede the reparation plant-removal program.

4. The charter was written for an Inter-Allied Reparation Agency which would allocate specific items of German reparation among the member governments. All of the 18 governments which participated in the Paris Conference have since become members of the Agency, which has been in

¹³ The term *substantial* is not defined by the Paris Agreement, and the definition must be supplied by the Inter-Allied Reparation Agency, which is responsible for the allocation of industrial equipment among the signatory governments.

operation several months with headquarters at Brussels.¹⁴

5. Agreement was reached on a series of provisions implementing the United Nations effort to remove all German foreign assets from German control. Each government shall hold or dispose of German enemy assets within its jurisdiction in manners designed to achieve this end. In addition, each government undertook to charge the net proceeds of liquidation of all German enemy assets within its jurisdiction against its reparation account and to provide the Inter-Allied Reparation Agency with all information for which it asks as to the value of such assets and the amounts realized from their liquidation.

It was further agreed that German assets in the neutral countries shall be liquidated or disposed of in accordance with the authority of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France, pursuant to arrangements to be negotiated with these countries. The net proceeds of such liquidation or disposition shall be made available to the Inter-Allied Reparation Agency for distribution among the member governments on reparation account. Switzerland, the first neutral country to reach agreement on this subject with the United States, France, and the United Kingdom, has recently undertaken to make available 50 percent of the proceeds from German assets within Switzerland.¹⁵ Similar negotiations are being or will be held with other neutral countries.

6. A share of German reparation was allocated to the large number of non-repatriable victims of German persecution, who are not in a position to turn to an Allied government for present help through the reparation mechanism.

The group of non-repatriable persons for whom this aid is intended, estimated to number hundreds of thousands, is made up, in part, of German and Austrian refugees and, in part, of nationals of countries formerly occupied by the Germans who were victims of Nazi concentration camps. All of this group have suffered severely from German action, and many have lost not only all their property but also their families, friends, and connections in the wholesale massacres carried out by the Nazis.

The share of reparation set aside to aid this

group of persons consists of all the non-monetary gold found by the Allied armed forces in Europe—in particular the boxes of SS loot collected from Nazi crematories and composed primarily of tooth-fillings, rings, and other items removed by the Nazis from their victims—a sum of \$25 million to be met out of the proceeds of German assets in neutral countries, and also assets in neutral countries of victims of Nazi action who have since died and left no heirs. Representatives of the Governments of the United States, France, the United Kingdom, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia are presently meeting in Paris to work out, as provided in the Paris Agreement, a general plan for the use of the fund thus to be made available. The fund is to be used to further the rehabilitation and resettlement of eligible persons and does not prejudice their claims against a future German Government for compensation or other benefits.

7. Agreement was reached upon a method for the restitution of the monetary gold looted by or wrongfully removed to Germany and subsequently recovered by the United Nations. The bulk of the gold recovered was captured by United States armed forces in Germany. The gold recovered is being restored to the countries from which it was looted or removed, in recognition of their right to restitution under the principles of the Allied Declaration on Axis Acts of Dispossession of January 5, 1943, and the United Nations Gold Declaration of February 22, 1944. These declarations—particularly the Gold Declaration—warned the neutral countries that Germany was looting property in the occupied areas and that she had exhausted the legitimate gold reserve with which she had entered the war, with the result that gold offered to the neutrals after these declarations must, of necessity, have been looted. Under this assumption, gold found in Germany by the Allied forces must likewise have been looted.

The so-called "gold pot" principle of restitution was adopted, under which all monetary gold found in Germany by the Allied forces, or recovered from a third country to which it was transferred by Germany, is to be pooled for distribution as restitution among the countries participating in the pool in proportion to their respective losses of gold through looting or by wrongful removal to Germany. The monetary gold thus accruing to a country will be accepted in full satisfaction of all its claims against Germany for restitution

¹⁴ An article in a following issue of the BULLETIN will describe the Agency and its role in the Allied reparation program.

¹⁵ BULLETIN of June 2, 1946, p. 955.

Proposals for Amendment of ILO Constitution

Article by BERNARD WIESMAN

AT A TIME when new public international agencies are beginning their activities or are being established, especial interest attaches to the proposed revision of the constitution of the International Labor Organization which was originally adopted in 1919 as part XIII of the Treaty of Versailles. For the past two years a continuing discussion of possible alterations has been carried on at meetings of the Governing Body and its Committee on Constitutional Questions and at the International Labor Conferences of Philadelphia in 1944 and Paris in 1945. At the latter meeting it was voted to place the approximately one hundred such suggestions in the hands of a small "Working Party" for the purpose of achieving specific recommendations for the consideration of member governments and subsequent submission to the 1946 International Labor Conference which will convene at Montreal on September 19.

In keeping with the tripartite character of the Conference, the government, employers' and workers' delegates respectively selected representatives to serve on the Working Party, with the understanding that they would seek to reach agreement on a practicable constitution acceptable to the three groups. Six governments were named to participate, each to name its representative, and three employer and three worker representatives were elected. The Working Party convened on January 21 in the offices of the Ministry of Labor and National Service, St. James Square, London, and adjourned on February 15. The following individuals composed the group, with the Chairman of the Governing Body of the ILO, Mr. G. Myrddin Evans, presiding:

GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES:

United States of America: Miss Frieda Miller, Chief of the Women's Bureau, Department of Labor.

Mr. Wiesman is Chief of the International Labor Organizations Branch, Division of International Labor, Social and Health Affairs, Department of State.

Adviser: Bernard Wiesman, Chief, International Labor Organizations Branch, Department of State.

China: Pao Hua-Kuo, Member of the Planning Commission, Ministry of Social Affairs.

Adviser: Djang Tien Kai, Chief of the Bureau of Factory and Mining Inspection, Ministry of Social Affairs.

Cuba: Orlando Aranalde, Chief of Statistics Section, Secretary of National Minimum Wage Committee.

France: Henry Hauck, Director of Labor Relations and Social Questions in the Ministry of Labor and Social Security.

Adviser: Jean Morellet, Member of the Council of State.

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland: G. Myrddin Evans, C.B., Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Labor and National Service, Chairman of the Governing Body of the ILO.

Adviser: H. M. Phillips, Assistant Secretary, Ministry of Labor.

Union of South Africa: A. D. Lee, Workmen's Compensation Commissioner, Department of Labor.

EMPLOYERS' REPRESENTATIVES:

F. Yllanes Ramos, Member of the Executive Committee of the Confederation of Chambers of Industry, Mexico.

P. Waline, General Secretary of the Federation of Metal and Mining Industries, France.

Sir John Forbes-Watson, Director of the British Employers' Confederation.

Substitutes: D. S. Erulkar, Chairman of the Indian Chamber of Commerce in Great Britain.
Jules Lecocq, Secretary-General, International Organization of Industrial Employers.

WORKERS' REPRESENTATIVES:

Joseph Hallsworth, General Secretary of the National Union of Distributive and Allied Workers, United Kingdom.

Leon Jouhaux, General Secretary of the General Confederation of Labor, France.

Robert J. Watt, International Representative, American Federation of Labor.

Substitute: Gunnar Andersson, President of the Swedish Confederation of Trade Unions.

For the discussions on the sections dealing with the representation and the seat of the organization, the Belgian Government participated through Mr. Fernand Dehousse and the Swiss Government through Prof. William Rappard and Mr. Max Kaufmann. The International Labor Office was represented by the Assistant Director, Mr. Lindsay Rogers, and the Legal Adviser, Mr. C. Wilfred Jenks, whose skill in draftsmanship proved of particular value in expediting the work of the delegation.

The proposed revision and accompanying report were agreed to by all members of the delegation on February 15 except that the French Government representative dissented on the section concerning representation and that both Mr. Jouhaux and Mr. Andersson were unable to be present on the closing days of the session. It was understood, of course, that individual governments were not bound by the actions of their representatives and that, in the event that the draft should prove generally unacceptable to the conference, individual members would be free to withdraw their assent to particular proposals or to resubmit proposals which were yielded in the Working Party's discussion.

Before analyzing the recommendations of the Working Party reference should be made to the action of the Twenty-seventh Session of the International Labor Conference at Paris in adopting three amendments for submission to member governments to assure continuance and autonomy of the organization upon the dissolution of the League of Nations, with which certain structural ties were established in the treaty of 1919. The first of these changes provided that amendments to the constitution could henceforth be adopted by two-thirds majority vote of the conference and acceptance or ratification by two thirds of the members of the organization including five of the eight states members of chief industrial importance. This provision also required ratification by each member of the Council of the League of Nations and by three fourths of the ILO members, a requirement which involved a delay of

several years in the adoption of the only amendment of the inter-war period.

The second proposal of the conference was that the International Labor Organization should be authorized to make appropriate financial and budgetary arrangements with the United Nations and that, until or except when such arrangements are in effect, the conference by two-thirds vote might arrange for approval, allocation, and collection of the budget with expense allocation among members to be determined by a committee of government representatives. This amendment would also introduce a general rule that members in arrears for an amount of contributions due for the preceding two full years should have no vote.

The third major amendment eliminates the present arrangement whereby membership in the League of Nations carried with it membership in the ILO and provides that any member of the United Nations may become a member of the ILO upon communicating to the Director its formal acceptance of the obligations contained in the ILO constitution. Other states may be admitted by a vote of two thirds of the delegates including two thirds of the government delegates present and voting.

These amendments have been transmitted to the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States for acceptance since it was on the basis of Public Resolution 43 of 1934 that the President was authorized to accept membership.

RELATIONS WITH UNITED NATIONS

In addition to the proposed amendments as to financing and as to the right of membership in the ILO on the part of members of the United Nations, a resolution was adopted at Paris expressing the desire of the ILO to enter into relations with the United Nations on mutually acceptable terms and authorizing the Governing Body to enter into such necessary or desirable agreements with the appropriate authorities for this purpose, subject to the approval of the conference. The Working Party, noting that a pledge of cooperation is already contained in the Declaration of Philadelphia, agreed that an additional explicit declaration should be proposed for inclusion within the constitution stating that "the International Labor Organization shall cooperate within the terms of this Constitution with any general international organization entrusted with the coordination of the activities of public international organizations having

specialized responsibilities and with public international organizations having specialized responsibilities in related fields." In the accompanying report it is made clear that the term *public international organizations* refers to intergovernmental agencies and has been so used in several international instruments of this sort.

In addition, amendments have been proposed to authorize arrangements for the non-voting participation in ILO deliberations by representatives of public international organizations, in accordance with the general pattern for such collaboration contained in the report of the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations. The Governing Body would be required to consider any suggestions for the agenda item of the conference which may be made by any public international agency under a proposed insertion in the text of article 14.

Pending actual negotiations with the United Nations, the Working Party concluded that the present and proposed provisions would be sufficiently broad and flexible to meet the probable constitutional requirements for entering into the desired relation with the United Nations.¹

EFFECTIVENESS OF CODE

The central unique character of the ILO is found in the formulation through its tripartite International Labor Conference of international standards which member governments are bound to submit for possible ratification or legislative implementation. Toward that objective the major work of the organization is directed, with expert committees and the highly skilled research and advisory staff of the office both preparing the way for and following up after the discussions and decisions of the representatives of member governments, employers, and workers. These standards are embodied in conventions or recommendations which became major influences upon the social legislation of member and even non-member nations during the inter-war period.

¹ Terms of a draft agreement between the United Nations and the International Labor Organization were agreed upon by the negotiating committee of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations and the negotiating committee of the International Labor Organization at New York City on May 28 and 29 and were initiated by the respective chairmen on May 30. This agreement will be submitted for approval by the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations and by the International Labor Conference before becoming effective.

Under the existing constitution each member is obligated to bring each convention and recommendation before the authority or authorities within whose competence the matter lies for the enactment of legislation or other action.

The appropriate action involves ratification, except in the case of federal states which may treat conventions as recommendations if constitutional limitations upon legislative authority of the federal state prevent such ratification. During the United States period of membership, the President has submitted only eight ILO conventions to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification, five of which concerning maritime labor were ratified. If the competent authority fails to ratify, there is no further obligation under the present constitution. Similarly, no obligation except that of submission now exists with respect to recommendations. When a convention has been ratified, formal notification must be made, and any necessary legislative implementation provided. Periodic reports as to the application of ratified conventions are required.

More than 900 ratifications of the 67 conventions have been registered by the approximately 50 members during the inter-war period, despite the extreme economic difficulties during the latter half of the period and the tenseness of the political atmosphere preceding the outbreak of war in 1939. The influence of these conventions upon social legislation in member countries is probably reflected in but scanty fashion by the actual count of ratifications, but the high value and pervasive influence of the international labor code thus created have been beclouded by the failure of some members to ratify or adequately to implement their formal acceptance.

The Working Party accepted the thesis propounded by the British employers' representative that the moral obligation with respect to conventions must be fully reenforced without impairment of sovereign authority and that the major test of effectiveness must be sought in the extent of application even more than in the number of ratifications.

Although Mr. Jouhaux and some other members of the Working Party asserted that the world must move toward an international authority in economic as well as political fields, it was agreed unanimously that previous proposals for seeking to make conventions mandatory upon members would be entirely impracticable at this time.

Hence the Working Party sought a formula to increase government responsibility under both conventions and recommendations without encroachment upon the legislative sovereignty of member nations.

These changes include one to remove the ambiguity inherent in the existing term "draft convention" which has led to a conception in some circles that submission for ratification was optional. Since the position was taken that a convention adopted by the International Labor Conference but not yet ratified is the equivalent of a diplomatic convention signed but not yet ratified rather than of an unsigned and unratified instrument, the Working Party agreed that the word "draft" should be deleted.

Significant new obligations would be imposed upon members under the following four amendments designed to emphasize and implement the quasi-legislative character of the conference and yet not to limit in any way the freedom of decision by member nations. Thus it is proposed first that members shall report on the measures taken to submit conventions and recommendations to the competent authority or authorities and give particulars as to the agencies regarded as competent and as to the action taken by them.

Secondly, it is proposed to amend the present provision that if a convention is not ratified by the competent authority, "no further obligation shall rest upon the Member". The amendment would add "except that it shall report to the Director of the International Labor Office, at appropriate intervals as requested by the Governing Body, the position of its law and practice in regard to the matters dealt with in the Convention and showing the extent to which effect has been given or is proposed to be given to any of the provisions of the Convention by legislation, administrative action, collective agreement or otherwise and stating the difficulties which prevent or delay the ratification of such Convention."

The third change would provide, in the case of recommendations upon which no reports are now constitutionally required, a similar obligation to report upon request "the position of the law and practice in their country in regard to the matters dealt with in the Recommendation and showing the extent to which effect has been given or is proposed to be given to the provisions of the Recommendation and such modifications of these provi-

sions as have been found or may be found necessary to make in adopting or applying them."

It is then proposed that each member be obligated to communicate copies of such information and reports to its country's most representative organizations of employers and workers, which constitutionally must respectively be consulted for the selection of delegates from each of the two groups.

Two other closely associated changes are proposed. To clarify the appropriate use of recommendations, a test is proposed to describe them as designed "to meet circumstances where the subject, or aspect of it, dealt with is not considered suitable or appropriate at that time for a Convention." The existing clause that the adoption of a convention or recommendation shall not serve to lessen the protection of existing law to workers concerned would be strengthened under a proposed clarifying amendment.

COLLECTIVE AGREEMENTS RECOGNIZED

The proposed requirements for reporting constitute the major change in the ILO constitution recommended by the Working Party. It was felt by the group that the completeness of the reporting program would not only give impetus to the ratification of conventions and recommendations but would also afford a realistic yardstick of the effectiveness of the ILO in stimulating international improvement of working conditions. The proposed changes, if adopted, would focus the attention of national organizations as well as their counterparts in other countries upon the real standards of working conditions as distinguished from statutory minima.

The proposals are especially significant in that they represent a recognition, it is believed for the first time on an intergovernmental basis, of the effectiveness of collective-bargaining agreements as a substitute for or supplement to governmental action in improving conditions of employment. Although the ILO is the only major public international agency in which employers and workers together have the authority and responsibility of voting on a par with governments, the focus of its efforts to improve conditions has been through the governmental implementation of international minimum standards. Like any minimum-wage legislation, the level has been below that generally in practice in industrialized countries, at least for the members of the labor unions from which

the delegates and advisers are chosen. Within the United States where exceptional effort to secure Federal action would be necessary on matters at least traditionally regarded as within the competence of State rather than of the Federal Government, labor unions have lacked any real incentive to seek ratification of conventions which set forth standards below those established through collective agreement. Furthermore, many trade unionists here believe that collective agreements rather than legislation provide the proper medium for improvement of working conditions. In introducing the concept of collective agreements as one of the measurements of national progress toward social goals, the ILO thus makes a limited but significant step towards official recognition of employer-union responsibility for social progress and suggests a tendency away from reliance upon government intervention.

Recognition of existing high standards based on legislation or administrative action is also implicit in the proposed procedure for reporting on unratified conventions.

These steps are not proposed as substitutes for ratification. The Working Party recognized that conventions constitute a relatively long-range commitment among ratifying states to maintain standards and that neither statutory provisions nor collective agreements can provide the same assurance to competing nations that established standards will be maintained for a stated period, usually of ten years.

The emphasis upon reporting, if adopted, will impose an administrative burden upon the United States where the legislation of 48 States plus the District of Columbia and Territories would have to be analyzed for such reports. At the same time, however, it will provide recognition of the relatively high levels in force here which are ignored under the present criteria of the number of ratifications.

OTHER QUESTIONS ON CONVENTIONS

Proposals to amend the present provisions concerning federal states were held in abeyance pending a session of the Working Party at Montreal to which the representatives of federal governments are to be invited. Since this Government was the only federal state among the six governments represented at London, it was felt unwise to attempt a decision on the proposal which would require federal governments to transmit to

the states or provinces such conventions as appear outside the competence of the federal government.

It is proposed to delete present provisions to authorize commissions of enquiry to indicate measures of an economic character which might be taken by other members against a defaulting government. The Governing Body deemed such references inappropriate in view of the highly political character of such moves and in view of the terms of the Charter of the United Nations.

Suggestions for the establishment of international inspection agencies appeared inappropriate, but the Working Party agreed that great emphasis should be placed upon the development of competent national inspection services. Suggestions for early consideration of a convention on the subject are therefore to be placed before the Governing Body. A model clause for use in future conventions requiring use of adequate inspection services is also proposed. Also the Working Party proposes that article 10 of the constitution be amended to authorize the office, subject to Governing Body directions, to provide technical assistance to member governments, on request, in the framing of laws and regulations and in the improvement of systems of administration and inspection.

Proposals are also included for referral of questions concerning the constitution or conventions to the International Court of Justice and for the appointment of a tribunal for expeditious determination of questions affecting the interpretation of conventions.

GOVERNING BODY

New provisions concerning the Governing Body are designed to recognize the responsibilities and authority which, in practice, are already lodged in that group and to assure the authority of the Governing Body in controlling the work of the office without any undue interference with its effectiveness. No changes in composition are recommended.

REGIONAL ACTIVITIES

With general agreement existing as to the desirability of strengthening regional activities, such as that represented in the April 1, 1946 Third Conference of American States Members of the ILO at Mexico City, it was agreed to include an authorization to the organization "to convene such regional conferences and establish such regional

agencies as may be desirable to promote the aims and purposes of the Organization."

At the same time it was found unwise to suggest regional conventions since the basic concept of the ILO is to promote world-wide improvement of conditions. The possibility of including within general conventions modifications designed to recognize regional circumstances having already been demonstrated, it was felt that regional conferences could fulfil reliable functions in advising on the need for and nature of such modifications.

APPLICATION TO TERRITORIES

Clarification of procedure and responsibilities with respect to the application of conventions to dependent territories is undertaken through a series of amendments too detailed to permit full analysis here. Essentially it was aimed to achieve a maximum of ILO service to territories through the application of conventions by the responsible metropolitan powers or their own authorities wherever sufficient autonomy has been achieved. The Working Party sought to balance the desire for prompt application with respect for the delays encountered wherever the metropolitan power has accepted a substantial degree of autonomy by the territories and has therefore yielded its authority to legislate on behalf of such territories. The proposed amendments call for detailed reports as to the application and implementation of conventions in each category of territory.

Respect for local autonomy where it exists is also seen in the proposal to include in article 3 a provision which, in the language of the report, would authorize "each Member responsible for the international relations of non-metropolitan territories to appoint as additional advisers to each of its delegates persons nominated by it as representatives of territories which have already attained a certain stage of autonomous development and persons nominated by it to advise its delegation in regard to matters concerning non-self-governing territories."

REPRESENTATION

The only issue upon which unanimity was not reached was that of representation at international labor conferences. The considerations which induced the Versailles conferees to agree upon the existing ratio of two government delegates to one employer and one worker representative still proved valid in the opinion of the majority.

Leon Jouhaux, on whose behalf the discussion was originally delayed until February 6, was unable to be present because of duties on a World Federation of Trade Unions Commission studying conditions in Germany. His exact position is therefore not known, but his two associates representing workers did not press for an increase in worker representation as proposed in two pending suggestions, one which had been advanced officially by the Belgian Government for a 2-2-2 ratio and one by a group of Latin American workers with Vicente Lombardo Toledano as spokesman for a 2-1-2 ratio. Fernand Dehousse was designated by the Belgian Government to attend the meeting on February 6 at which the proposal was discussed, in accordance with the invitation of the Conference, but since he was not a member of the Working Party the advocacy of the proposal within the Working Party was performed by Henry Hauck, who officially presented the French Government's support of the Belgian proposal. Mr. Hauck argued with great skill and effectiveness, but the conclusion of the other members was that the usefulness of the ILO depends upon the equality of employer and worker representation and the present degree of government responsibility for the adoption of decisions which can be implemented effectively at this time only by government action.

The Belgian proposal would have afforded representation for minority as well as "the most representative" organization of workers and would have designated one of the two employer delegates, in the case of countries with mixed economies, to represent the socialized part of industry. The Latin American proposal specifically opposed the representation of minority groups and proposed that the second workers' delegate be named by the most representative organization of workers to represent those engaged in socialized undertakings.

One consequence of the Belgian proposal would be that the workers' delegation would become representatives (1) of the most representative organization, and (2) of the minority group or groups, rather than as at present the representative of all the workers of the country. It was feared by the group that this would transfer the problems of domestic labor disunity within any country to the international level, with probable disastrous effect upon the negotiation in committees and conferences. The idea advanced by Mr.

Dehousse that each delegate would have his own group of advisers if agreement on a single slate were not feasible proved particularly disconcerting to the Working Party, which also saw no easing of governmental difficulties in selection if the second delegate must be accredited specifically as a minority delegate representing not only the second largest but also any other representative minorities. It was pointed out that if domestic agreement could not be reached in the selection of delegates and advisers, it would be unlikely that agreement would be reached if two rival groups were participating at the international level.

As for the Latin American proposal, the workers' delegates insisted that workers in socialized undertakings have essentially the same interest as workers in private employment and that any reasonable need for representation of such workers could be obtained, as it was in the American delegation to the 1945 conference, by the inclusion of an officer of a state employees' organization among the advisers to the workers' delegate.

With respect to the Belgian proposal concerning the representation of the managements of socialized undertakings, it was pointed out that such an individual would presumably reflect government views and might more properly be included within the government representation or, with the concurrence of the most representative organization of employers, might be included within the employers' delegation as on at least one previous occasion. It was also noted that during the period of U.S.S.R. participation representatives of Soviet industrial management were accepted as employers' delegates since no other such representation was possible under the Soviet economy.

All delegates emphasized the essential necessity of maintaining the tripartite character of the organization and, except for the French Government spokesman, all agreed that the present ratio is the one under which the financial, legislative, and the proposed increase in administrative responsibility of the governments could be properly reflected. It was also noted that equality of voting is practiced in the influential committees of the conference and among the seven newly established industrial committees, but that neither of those agencies possesses the authority inherent in the conference to draft conventions and recom-

mendations which create certain obligations upon the national states which compose the International Labor Organization.

OTHER IMPORTANT ACTIONS

Existing practice is recognized by a proposal that the constitution provide for the election of a chairman and two vice-chairmen of the Governing Body, each from one of the three component groups, and a further strengthening provides for the election of the three vice-chairmen of the conference to reflect the three groups.

A proposal is made similar to that of article 71 of the Charter of the United Nations whereby "The International Labor Organization may make suitable arrangements for such consultation as it may think desirable with recognized non-governmental international organizations, including international organizations of employers, workers, agriculturists and cooperators."

Similarly, the resources of non-governmental organizations may be utilized through article 18, which would permit the conference to appoint to its committees technical experts without the power to vote.

Authorization for publications in such languages as the body may think desirable would replace the present more restrictive language under another proposal.

Another change of more than technical importance is proposed: a simple majority of votes cast by delegates present will be sufficient except as otherwise specified in the constitution "or by the terms of any Convention or other instrument conferring powers upon the Conference or of the financial and budgetary arrangements adopted in virtue of Article 13".

The international character of the responsibilities of the staff would be made entirely clear and exclusive under other changes.

The Working Party also made a number of administrative recommendations for consideration of the Governing Body, arising out of the suggestions before it.

THE DECLARATION OF PHILADELPHIA

The objectives stated in the preamble of the constitution of the ILO and the principles set forth in article 41 were regarded in 1919 as embodying unrealized objectives; in 1946 they had

(Continued on page 1052)

Selective Service Processing of American Citizens Outside the United States

THE SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940, both before and after amendments, provided for the registration, training, and service of "every male citizen of the United States" within specified age groups. Section 2 of the act, relating to registration, provided that a citizen liable for registration under the act should "present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places and in such manner and in such age group or groups as shall be determined by laws and regulations prescribed hereunder."

In pursuance of this authority regulations were issued requiring persons liable for registration under the act to present themselves at such time and place as might be fixed by presidential proclamation. Thus, while there was a general obligation for all male citizens within the specified age limits to register, the specific obligation did not arise in the case of any individual until called upon by presidential proclamation.

Between September 16, 1940 and November 17, 1942 the President issued a series of six proclamations calling upon citizens in different age groups to present themselves for registration. In each case the proclamation excepted citizens residing outside the "United States" (continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico) and provided that such citizens must register within five days after their return to this country. By implication citizens who had not been in the "United States" at a time when they were liable for registration had no obligations under the Selective Service law.

In the early days of Selective Service operations the armed forces were concentrating on *numbers* of inductees to such an extent that little thought was given to potential registrants living outside the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. When over 400,000 men a month were being inducted it did not seem urgent to expend valuable time and effort on the scattered American citizens in outlying areas. Accordingly, no procedures were established prior to October 26,

1943 to bring these citizens within the scope of the operation of Selective Service.

During the latter part of 1943, when there began to be a serious shortage of manpower in the United States, when claims for both occupational and dependency deferments were being scrutinized carefully, and when a large percentage of such claims were being denied, a demand arose for Selective Service to take some action to impose equal obligations upon United States citizens who, by reason of their geographic location, had not previously been required to register.

On October 26, 1943 the President, having in mind the situation as outlined above, issued a proclamation calling for the registration between November 15, 1943 and January 1, 1944 of all United States citizens between the ages of 18 and 45 residing outside the United States who had not previously been registered. In practical effect only three groups of men were affected by the proclamation: those living in foreign countries; those in the Panama Canal Zone; and those in the Virgin Islands. In his proclamation the President called upon all other United States Government agencies to assist Selective Service as far as possible.

The Department of State, through the instrumentality of its Foreign Service, was the obvious agency to assist Selective Service with respect to Americans in foreign countries. The Office of the Panama Canal was the obvious agency to operate on behalf of Selective Service in the Canal Zone. Following the initial registration in the Virgin Islands, which was accomplished by special registrars, the usual Selective Service machinery was set up there to operate in essentially the same way as in continental United States.

In order to enable them to fulfil their role in the registration, American diplomatic and consular officers were appointed by the Director of Selec-

This article was prepared in the Division of Foreign Service Administration, Office of the Foreign Service, Department of State.

tive Service to serve without additional compensation as chief registrars. In that capacity they were not only empowered personally to receive registrations but also to appoint reliable American citizens as volunteer registrars. American men and women signed waiver-of-compensation forms and were sworn in as registrars under such appointments at hundreds of outlying locations where there was no American diplomatic or consular office. Thus it was made as convenient as possible for every American man, wherever situated, to meet his obligation to register by appearing in person before a duly authorized registrar.

Through the press and radio, by the mailing of circular letters and by the posting of notices in public places, the American diplomatic and consular offices gave publicity to the registration requirement.¹ The registration proceeded, commencing November 16, 1943 as required by the proclamation, without untoward incident; 19,557 citizens were registered in foreign countries from November 16 to December 31, 1943, inclusive, and the registration cards were forwarded to the Selective Service System through the Department of State. Citizens continued to be registered after January 1, 1944 in foreign countries at the rate of about 600 a month for the first few months, a rate which gradually decreased.

As of November 1, 1945 there had been forwarded to the Selective Service System 6,120 registration cards dated later than December 31, 1943. Some of the 6,120 were the registrations of persons attaining the age of 18 years, but a number were those of older men registering tardily for miscellaneous reasons. Many of the latter were Americans, including some internees, who, because they were in enemy or enemy-occupied territory during November and December of 1943, could not possibly have registered during those months. Their registrations came in only when one area after another was taken from the enemy during 1944 and 1945 and representation of the Department of State reestablished in those areas.

The 19,557 "on time" registrations, added to the 6,120 "late" registrations, make a total of 25,677. This total does not include the figure for the Panama Canal Zone, which was about 3,475, or that for the Virgin Islands, which was about 3,500 persons.

All the foregoing figures are inclusive of men

up to 45 years of age. It is to be borne in mind that, except for routine transmittal and recording operations, the cases of persons over 38 have been permitted to become inactive, since men in that age bracket have not been acceptable for induction either at the time of the foreign registration or subsequently. The foregoing figures do not, however, include several thousands of men who had registered directly with local boards in the United States in compliance with previous proclamations and who, subsequent to registering, left the country without having been called for military service. Many had gone overseas as civilians on war-connected work, and others in line of their normal pursuits. In any event, the net number of cases subject to processing through Department of State facilities in foreign countries, regardless of when or where originally registered, proved prior to V-E Day to be about 25,000 in the active bracket over 18 and under 38 years of age. Since V-J Day when men over 26 years of age became unacceptable to the armed forces, the net number of active cases has, of course, been greatly reduced.

When citizens are registered abroad a special form of registration card (DSS Form 1-F) is used. This form allows the registrant to designate a residence in the United States, and the local board having jurisdiction over that place becomes his local board, to which his registration card is forwarded. If he does not designate a place of residence in the United States his registration card is forwarded to a specially established local board, designated as Local Board No. 1 (Foreign) of Washington, D. C. All registrants failing to designate a place of residence in the United States thus become registrants of Local Board No. 1 (Foreign). Approximately 60 percent of all outside registrations have fallen within the jurisdiction of Local Board No. 1 (Foreign) of Washington. The remaining 40 percent have been distributed among the local boards throughout the United States. A copy of every registration card has been retained at National Headquarters of the Selective Service System.

Local Board No. 1 (Foreign) has as many registrants as some of the larger local boards in the United States. Under the special circumstances of the "outside" registration, it has been necessary for the board to process these registrants within the space of a few months, whereas most local boards have done the same work gradually over

¹ BULLETIN of Oct. 30, 1943, p. 300.

a period of four years. The actual operational functions have been much greater than for those of "inside" registrants, since all communications with registrants are of necessity in writing and subject to special routing. Moreover, there are difficulties of citizenship, transportation, unusual occupations, and dozens of decisions which are out of the ordinary and require special action. Special commendation should be given to the members of Local Board No. 1 (Foreign) and its clerks for an excellent handling of the situation.

Prior to 1944, the Selective Service System had adhered to a concept that registrants in foreign countries were liable, when summoned, to report at their respective local boards (or at least at the office of some local board in the United States) at their own expense. With the extension of the registration requirement to Americans living in foreign countries, Selective Service regulations were relaxed to make systematic allowance for the time required to process individual cases outside the United States, and to provide for the furnishing of Government transportation to a registrant who elected to report for induction at a nearby installation of the United States armed forces in lieu of reporting to his local board in the United States (Selective Service Local Board Memorandum No. 189).

The actual classification of "outside" registrants has been fundamentally no different from that of registrants in this country. However, during the war it was most difficult to determine whether or not a registrant was in war work if, for example, he was working in a neutral country or in a co-belligerent nation which was in fact not supplying either food or troops for the war effort. In certain instances, the advice was sought of the United States Department of Commerce, the Department of State, and other United States governmental representatives.

Under the system adopted for the processing of cases in foreign countries, Selective Service registrants (other than delinquents) have not been ordered to report for final physical examination and induction before they have had preliminary physical examinations at or near their places of foreign residence. American diplomatic and consular officers have made arrangements for these preliminary examinations, utilizing the services of medical officers of the United States armed forces or civilian medical officers of the United

States Government where available. Where American Government physicians have been unavailable, private American or foreign doctors have been engaged to conduct the examinations and furnish sworn reports thereof. As of November 1, 1945 the Medical Division of National Headquarters of the Selective Service System in Washington had received through the Department of State and had reviewed 4,587 reports of preliminary physical examinations. The same forms have been used and (with the exception that practical considerations have necessitated the omission of chest X-rays in most cases) the same items have been covered as at induction stations in the United States, including serological tests and urinalyses.

About one fourth of the 4,587 examinees were found, on the basis of the reports of preliminary examinations, to have disqualifying defects and were classified by the Selective Service System as physically unfit (4-F). Men whose preliminary physical reports disclosed no disqualifying defects were retained in class 1-A, to be processed for induction.

A special form of "Order To Report for Induction" (DSS Form 150-F) was prescribed for use by local boards in connection with the induction of men residing in foreign countries. This form, in the name of the President of the United States, orders the registrant to report at his own expense to the office of his local board within 60 days of the date of the order, or permits him either to enlist at an armed-forces installation outside of the United States or to report at Government expense for induction at the particular installation named on the form, on a date specified. The installation to which the registrant may proceed at Government expense is designated in each case by either the Army or the Navy; the date upon which the registrant should report is determined by the American diplomatic or consular officer allowing normal transit time from the registrant's home to the place of induction plus 10 days.

Of 1,790 men known as of November 1, 1945 to have entered the United States armed forces under this method of processing, 300 returned at their own expense to the offices of the respective local boards; 599 proceeded at their own expense to enlist at an armed-forces installation of their own choice outside the United States; and 891 pro-

(Continued on page 1051)

German Documents on Relations With Japan

Foreign Office Memorandum

BERLIN, August 26, 1939

St. S. Nr. 648. Secret.

I received the Japanese Ambassador this evening at his request. As we had already been informed by Ambassador Ott, he had two matters to discuss and took them up in the following order:

1. He handed me a note in which the Japanese Government directed to the German Government an "earnest protest" on account of the alleged inconsistency of the German-Russian non-aggression pact with the German-Japanese agreement.

2. He read me a communication according to which the Japanese Government took the view that by the conclusion of the German-Russian pact the negotiations which had been previously carried on for a German-Italian-Japanese alliance were terminated.

In accordance with instructions, I stated to the Ambassador that I did not wish to discuss the matter with him officially, but as a friend and comrade. As far as the contents of the note went, it was known that it had been agreed between the Reich Foreign Minister and Oshima that the legal experts should get together to consult about the alleged inconsistency of the two treaties. I wanted to deny completely any inconsistency. Besides, in such serious periods in the life of nations, it was not legal technicalities that were of consequence, but realities as they were understood between men and soldiers. If at the present moment the Japanese Government considered it desirable to come to us with such complaints and even to present them to us in written form as an "earnest protest", I could only assure Oshima that his Government would get an ill-tempered answer, which would not be serviceable to the friendly relations between Japan and Germany for which we were all concerned.

With regard to placing the blame for the apparent end of the conversations about our treaty alliance, I said to Oshima that if the matter of blame was to be discussed, we were of the opinion that the blame was solely that of Foreign Minister

Arita, who had let us wait in a most unsuitable way for the last six months in spite of Germany's complete readiness. It was this conduct which would have to be blamed for the present development. I could assure Oshima also that this second part of his business would be rejected just as firmly by the Reich Foreign Minister if it came to his attention.

Then I suggested to Oshima, as a friend, that our conversation be treated as though it had never taken place and as if he had not even seen me at the Foreign Ministry. He could take his note back again and think over for twenty-four hours how he could get around carrying out the orders of his Government, which, however they might perhaps be required by Japanese domestic policy, did not correspond to the well-known interests of both of our countries.

Oshima took his documents back again and he left me with the intention of considering once more what he would do, but giving the impression of deep anxiety over his course since he had received unequivocal directions from Tokyo.

WEIZSÄCKER

Foreign Office Memorandum

BERLIN, September 18, 1939

St. S. Nr. 734

The Japanese Ambassador was given considerable information about the situation today by me. He referred to the visit of Take Ushi [*sic*]. He congratulated us on the success of the Polish campaign, etc. In conclusion, he came out in a somewhat ashamed manner with the attached document, which is dated August 26 and in connection with which he had the following to say:

Admittedly I had, at the end of August, talked him—Oshima—out of the idea of lodging the earnest protest of the Japanese Government on account of the inconsistency of the German-Russian non-aggression pact with the secret agreement between Germany and Japan. Out of consideration for the German Government at that critical stage, he had followed my advice. However, it was impossible for him to go directly contrary to the orders of his Government. He had, therefore,

simply telegraphed his Government that he had followed their directions. In reality he, Oshima, had postponed carrying out the step until now. He had waited for the conclusion of the Polish campaign and he declared that now the step was no longer of so much consequence, especially since he had, on his own account, taken all the bitterness out of the orders from Tokyo. He asked that I understand the accompanying note in that light.

I read the note, which really is no longer of very great consequence, but I received it from him for study only in my personal capacity and not officially. Oshima will explain the matter further himself if he sees the Reich Foreign Minister soon. He will then suggest that this document, with our consent, be allowed to disappear in the archives. He did not consider a discussion, especially one of a legalistic nature, to be desirable or timely.

I said to the Ambassador, in conclusion, that his view did not agree entirely with ours and that I had hoped that the matter could be finally disposed of. I was, however, ready to inform the Reich Foreign Minister in advance to the effect that he, Oshima, considered that he was bound to bring the matter to a formal conclusion in some way.

I did not consider it correct to refuse to receive the note from the Ambassador for consideration, since Oshima was apparently honestly concerned about disposing of the matter completely.

WEIZSÄCKER

[Enclosure]

The Japanese Embassy in Berlin to the German Foreign Office

The Japanese Embassy has the honor, on instructions from the Japanese Government, to inform the Foreign Office of the views of the Japanese Government in connection with the non-aggression and consultative pact recently concluded between the German Government and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as follows:

"The Japanese Government regards the non-aggression and consultative pact, recently concluded between the German Government and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as in contradiction to the secret annex to the agreement against the Communist International."

BERLIN, August 26, 1939.

Telegram from the German Ambassador in Japan (Ott) to the German Foreign Office

TOKYO, June 19, 1940, 10:18 a.m.

[Received June 19, 9:30 p.m.]

No. 594 of June 19.

Urgent. For the Reich Chancellery. Secret.

The Chief of the European Bureau of the Foreign Ministry informed me confidentially that the Japanese Ambassador in Berlin today received instructions to express to the German Government the congratulations of the Japanese Government on the German victory, and on this occasion to call attention to the special interest of Japan in the future fate of French Indochina. The Ambassador was to repeat the thanks of Japan for the friendly attitude of Germany in the Chinese conflict, and, at the same time, to indicate that Japan believed that she had furnished substantial assistance to Germany during the European war by holding the American forces in the Pacific Ocean. The Ambassador was instructed to suggest to the German Government, in return for this attitude of Japan, a friendly gesture with respect to Indochina. To the question of what form such a gesture should take, the Chief replied that the Foreign Ministry had in mind a German declaration to the effect that Japan would have a free hand in Indochina. According to the press the Japanese Ambassador to Rome has received similar instructions.

Since, in the course of the French collapse, the pressure of popular opinion urging the Government to action has become stronger, the Foreign Minister decided on this step to save his policy and his cabinet from an otherwise unavoidable fall. There was danger, however, that the Foreign Minister would make tactical use of the German free hand with respect to Indochina in negotiations for an agreement with America. Characteristic of the unaltered basic position of the Foreign Minister is the fact reported elsewhere that, on the same day, he came to a friendly agreement with England and France on [the question of] Tientsin.

As seen from Tokyo, the strengthening of Japanese power in East Asia through the addition of Indochina would be likely to be in the German interest. Thereby, on the one hand, the prospects for a speedy conclusion of the China conflict would be heightened and, on the other hand, the tension between Japan and the Anglo-Saxon pow-

ers would be so increased that danger of agreement would be eliminated for some time. If, therefore, it is intended to comply with the Japanese desire, a formula must be found which will bind Japan finally and unreservedly to our side. This could be accomplished especially if Japan had to pledge herself to take immediate possession of Indochina.

I learn confidentially from Army circles that in those circles the idea of occupation of the strategically important Yunnan Road is being agitated. If the Government should evade a similarly expressed demand for the occupation of Indochina, in case the matter should become public, it would have to expect at least that its position would be shaken and possibly that it would be dissolved and replaced by a cabinet closer to us.

OTT

Foreign Office Notation on Telegram No. 594 of June 19 from Tokyo on the Subject of Indochina

The thanks of Japan for the friendly attitude of Germany in the China conflict come rather late. The sacrifice which we have made on behalf of Japan (shutting off of delivery of war materials to China and the loss thereby of important Chinese raw materials) have so far received no recognition on the Japanese side, far less has any economic compensation been made. The Japanese request for a friendly gesture on the part of Germany is, in view of the attitude adopted by Japan toward Germany during the war in economic relations, somewhat surprising.

In case this is mentioned to the Japanese Ambassador in the course of the forthcoming discussion, the following examples may be cited:

1. Japanese shipping has, from the beginning, and in a most comprehensive manner, submitted itself to the English and French blockade controls.
2. The Japanese Government for a long time did not accede to the German desires for transit of goods through Japan and only in the last few months has she displayed some evidence of becoming more accommodating. Thus a shipment of wolfram from Canton and a shipment of tin from Colombia were transmitted to Germany. The Japanese Government also recently offered us, from its own supply, 100 tons each of wolfram and tin to be delivered without charge. There continue to be, however, requests that are still not com-

plied with; for instance, increase of Japanese sea trade with Vladivostok, which route is covered only three times per month by a Japanese steamer. Also, further shipment of tin from Colombia has so far been impossible on account of the refusal of the Japanese shipping line.

3. Japan, in January of this year, concluded a monopoly agreement with Manchukuo for her supply of soy beans without saying anything about it to us, although previously we were the largest importer; in 1938—for example—to the extent of 800,000 tons. After representations were made, Japan so far has only allotted 70,000 tons for delivery to us from Manchukuo.

4. Japan continues to refuse the return transportation from America in small groups of the crew of almost 500 men of the *Columbus*, since the members of the crew are regarded, from the English point of view, as participants in the war, although according to the American view they are regarded as shipwrecked individuals.

5. Japan, it is true, is delivering to us her entire production of whale oil from the last catch, some 75,000 tons. We know, however, from confidential sources, that she first offered half of it to England and decided to make delivery to us only when she got no satisfactory English offer.

For transmittal to the Secretary of State.

BERLIN, June 20, 1940.

WIEHL

Telegram from the German Foreign Minister to the German Ambassador in Japan

(Clear to the Foreign Ministry, in cipher to Tokyo)

EUROPA, July 1, 1941, 6:35 p. m.

Europa No. 634 (Forwarded to Tokyo as No. 942) Priority. Urgent. Secret.

I request you to deliver to the Foreign Minister as speedily as possible the following telegram from me addressed to him personally. The telegram is to be drawn up there on white paper, without heading, and with my signature. The text of the telegram follows:

"To His Excellency the Japanese Foreign Minister, Herr Matsuoka, Tokyo.

Personal. At the time of Your Excellency's visit in Berlin it was our intention that on the occasion of events which were of especial importance for the welfare of both our countries, we

would get into communication personally. Such a moment has now arrived and I have the honor to inform Your Excellency as follows:

(1) By the mighty blows of the German Armed Forces we have succeeded, in the first eight days of the German-Russian campaign, in breaking the backbone of the Russian Army. A considerable part of the best combat divisions of the enemy have been in part annihilated, in part captured, in part so shattered that the remnants will scarcely be able to appear again as effectives during the course of this war. The enemy air force is almost completely defeated, so that on the principal fighting front, since yesterday, German mastery of the air has become complete. Incalculable stores of material have been captured or destroyed. Detailed information about the quantities of such material will be given in the German Army communiqué.

Meanwhile the German armies are continuing to push farther east along the whole front. The coming operations of the German Army will, I have no doubt, destroy the remaining forces of the enemy in the same manner and it can be counted on, that perhaps even in only a few weeks Russian resistance over the whole European area of the Soviet Union will be broken. It is very likely, as I already told Your Excellency a few days ago through Ambassador Ott, that this in turn will result shortly in the total collapse of the Bolshevik régime.

2. From this military success, unparalleled in history, for which we have to thank first of all the valor of the German soldiery, and by which the great military threat to which Europe was exposed has been eliminated, arises the obligation on the part of the German leadership to create for the future a political situation in the East which would prevent for all time a repetition of such events. It is also our conviction that as long as Russia continues to exist as the nucleus of Bolshevism, neither Europe, nor East Asia, nor the world at large will ever have quiet. Germany is determined to draw the necessary consequences from this knowledge. She hopes to have the collaboration of Japan, since a final solution of the Russian question could be brought about most speedily and completely by Japan and Germany together.

3. The approaching collapse of the military power of Russia and the probable fall of the Bolshevik régime itself offers to Japan the unique

opportunity to free herself from the Russian threat and to give the Japanese Empire security in the north, which is a necessary prerequisite to her expansion in the south in accordance with her vital needs. It seems to me, therefore, the requirement of the hour that the Japanese Army should, as quickly as possible, get into possession of Vladivostok and push as far as possible toward the west. The aim of such an operation should be that, before the coming of cold weather, the Japanese Army advancing westward should be able to shake hands at the half-way mark with the German troops advancing to the east, that both by way of the Trans-Siberian Railroad and by air uninterrupted communication should be established between Germany and Japan by way of Russian territory, and that finally the whole Russian question should be solved by Germany and Japan in common in a way which would eliminate the Russian threat to both Germany and Japan for all time.

4. The defeat of the Soviet Union by Germany and Japan would allow us to bring the actual power of the states allied in the Three Power Pact into effective cooperation for the first time. Germany and Italy would then be the completely controlling elements in the entire European-African Hemisphere. They would then be in a position to strengthen their pressure on England enormously by bombardments from the air and by U-boats, and by appropriate operations bring about the final destruction of England. Japan, on her part, with her back free, would be able to devote her whole force to the final solution of the problems affecting her in the south. That the elimination of the Soviet régime would also ease the solution of the Chinese conflict is mentioned only in passing.

In respect to America, I hope that, after the defeat of Russia, the weight of the Three Power states, Germany, Italy, and Japan, and the powers allied to them, to whom I hope a considerable number of additional European states will soon be added, will suffice to paralyze any rising tendency in the United States to participate in the war.

Summing up I would like to state that:

I am convinced that with the triumph of German arms in the past weeks the historic opportunity has now come, perhaps never to recur, for Japan, together with Germany, to solve the Russian question and to free our peoples for a long time from every

(Continued on page 1050)

International Organizations and Conferences

Calendar of Meetings

Council of Foreign Ministers: Meeting of Foreign Ministers	Paris	April 25—adjourned on May 16 until June 15
Meeting of Deputies	Paris	May 27
Far Eastern Commission	Washington	February 26
PICAO: European and Mediterranean Air Route Services Conference	Paris	April 24
Meeting of the First Annual Assembly	Montreal	May 21
Allied-Swedish Negotiations for German External Assets	Washington	May 31
Inter-American Conference of Experts on Copyright	Washington	June 1
ILO: 28th (Maritime) Session of the International Labor Conference	Seattle	June 6
The United Nations: Security Council	New York	March 25
Military Staff Committee	New York	March 25
Special Committee on Refugees and Displaced Persons	London	April 8
Commissions of the Economic and Social Council	New York	April 29
Economic and Social Council	New York	May 25
Commission on Atomic Energy	New York	June 14
International Health Conference	New York	June 19
General Assembly: Second Part of First Session	New York	September 3

The dates in the calendar are as of June 9.

Activities and Developments

The Far Eastern Commission at its fourteenth meeting on June 5 approved unanimously a policy statement with respect to aliens in Japan (text follows). This policy statement embodies minor changes in the basic directive from the United States Government by which the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers has hitherto been governed.

The Commission considered a proposed request for consultation with the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers on the subject of the recent tours of the Emperor through Japan. It was unanimously agreed that the Commission should take no action on this subject at present, pending consideration by the Commission of the basic question

of democratic reform or abolition of the Emperor institution, and that both matters should be referred to Committee 3 for reconsideration and report.

I. STATEMENT OF POLICY REGARDING ALIENS IN JAPAN

1. The major policies in regard to aliens in Japan including Formosan-Chinese and Koreans are that:

a. Aliens should be allowed, if they so desire, to leave Japan as early as possible, except such persons who are held as war criminals or for security reasons; and

b. Subject to the general control of the Supreme

Commander the Japanese authorities should be held responsible for the care, safety, and welfare of such persons and for their transportation to ports of embarkation.

2. To carry out these policies, the following steps should be taken:

a. Neutral Nationals.

All nationals of neutral nations should be required to register with the appropriate military authorities and their respective governments should be notified as to the location and status of these persons. All nationals of neutral nations who have actively participated in any way in the war against one of the United Nations should be arrested for disposition in conformity with other instructions. Neutral nationals should be accorded no special privileges of communications or business relations with their home countries or people resident outside Japan. The persons, archives, and property of diplomatic and consular officials of neutrals should be accorded full protection.

b. United Nations Nationals.

(1) Civilians who are nationals of the United Nations should be, except as noted below, repatriated, if they so desire upon the concurrence of the government concerned. All such civilians resident or interned in Japan should be identified, examined closely and, if the Supreme Commander deems it advisable, placed in custody or restricted residence. The Supreme Commander should inform the representatives of the nationals' government of the reasons for the arrest or restricted residence of those nationals and consult with them concerning future treatment of such persons. Any such person who has played an active part in the formulation or execution of the Japanese program of aggression or who is believed to be desired by his government as a renegade or quisling should be held for disposition in accordance with applicable directives.

(2) Persons of Japanese race claiming citizenship of any other United Nation should be repatriated only upon concurrence of the government of such nation.

c. Stateless persons, Central European refugees from Nazi oppression and Italian non-Fascists should be assimilated in treatment to United Nations nationals, providing such persons have not supported the Axis cause.

d. Responsibilities of the Japanese Authorities.

Measures should be taken on behalf of United Nations nationals and neutrals to insure the health, welfare and transportation to a port from which they may embark for transoceanic destinations, and should, in so far as practicable, be the responsibility of the Japanese Government. Any deficiencies resulting in the carrying out of these measures in respect to United Nations nationals should be supplied by the Supreme Commander and the cost thereof should be charged to the Japanese Government. Repatriation from such a port should be provided in accordance with appropriate arrangements between the governments concerned.

e. Political, Racial and Religious Prisoners.

Prisoners of non-Japanese nationality found held by the Japanese should be examined for identification and their records reviewed for determination of the cause of detention. All those found to be detained solely on political, racial or religious grounds, should be released except those whom the Supreme Commander decides to hold for security reasons. Those detained should be given prompt trial.

f. Non-Japanese Nationals of the Countries which are or have been at war with the United Nations in the Second World War.

(1) All nationals of countries except Japan with which any of the United Nations are or have been at war in the Second World War (Bulgaria, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Rumania and Siam) should be identified and registered and may be interned or their activities curtailed as may be necessary under the circumstances. Diplomatic and consular officials of such countries except those identified as loyal to the cause of the United Nations should be taken into honorable custody, held for investigation, and thereafter repatriated in accordance with the provisions of subparagraphs (2), (3), (4) and (5) below.

Property, real and personal, owned or controlled by persons who have been detained or arrested under the provisions of the foregoing paragraph should be taken under control pending directions as to its eventual disposition.

(2) Those non-Japanese enemy nationals who were known as agents or propagandists of Nazism and Fascism (including research experts and students, scientifically skilled persons, persons holding administrative posts in commerce or gov-

ernment and all those who sought repatriation to enemy countries during the period of hostilities) should be interned and, after confirmation and agreement by the appropriate authorities in their home countries, repatriated.

(3) Those non-Japanese enemy nationals not subject to internment and repatriation should be given their freedom unless internment is necessary for their protection.

(4) The voluntary repatriation of enemy or ex-enemy nationals of non-Japanese nationality not subject to forceable repatriation should be permitted.

(5) Transportation to a port of embarkation for transoceanic destination should be at the expense of Japan and repatriation therefrom should be provided in accordance with appropriate arrangements between the governments concerned.

g. Formosan-Chinese and Koreans.

(1) The Supreme Commander should treat Formosan-Chinese and Koreans as liberated people in so far as military security permits. They are not included in the term "Japanese" as used in this paper but they have been Japanese subjects and may be treated, in case of necessity, as enemy nationals. They should be identified as to nationality, place of residence and present location. They may be repatriated if they so desire under such regulations as the Supreme Commander may establish. However, priority will be given to the repatriation of nationals of the United Nations.

The Supreme Commander, if he finds it necessary, should direct the repatriation of Formosan-Chinese and Koreans and coordinate such repatriation with the repatriation of Japanese nationals from Korea and Formosa.

(2) Arrangements for the repatriation of Formosan-Chinese should be made with the government of China by the United States Government.

(3) Pending completion of arrangements for the repatriation of Koreans formerly resident in Korea north of 38° North Latitude, between the Soviet Union and the United States, the Supreme Commander, if he finds it necessary, may repatriate such Koreans to that part of Korea south of 38° North Latitude.

(4) When arrangements have been entered into as indicated in subparagraphs (2) and (3) above, and subject to such arrangements, the Supreme Commander should permit voluntary repatriation of Formosan-Chinese and Koreans and may direct their repatriation if he deems such action necessary. Priority, however, should be given to the repatriation of nationals of the United Nations.

(5) Formosan-Chinese and Koreans should be protected from hostile Japanese elements. The Supreme Commander should insure that the Japanese authorities make adequate provision in fact for the care, safety and welfare of Formosan-Chinese and Koreans pending their repatriation.

h. Protection of Property.

(1) Within such limits as are imposed by the military situation, the Supreme Commander should take all reasonable steps necessary to preserve and protect the property of United Nations Nationals in Japan.

(2) Record of wages, bank deposits and ownership of securities and other personal property of all aliens should be preserved.

i. Return to Homes in Japan.

Aliens having homes in Japan and not held as war criminals or for security reasons, should be permitted to return to their homes as soon as conditions permit.

j. Use of UNRRA and Voluntary Agencies.

UNRRA and private relief agencies may be used at the discretion of the Supreme Commander wherever available in the care and repatriation of United Nations nationals and those assimilated to them in treatment.

Election of Bank and Fund Officials. Eugene Meyer of the United States was unanimously elected President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development on June 4.

Camille Gutt of Belgium was elected Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund at its meeting on May 6.

The Record of the Week

"Random Harvest"

BY UNDER SECRETARY ACHESON¹

LIFE FOR ALL OF US has been so concentrated on the immediate in these past years—each day with its pressing task; each meeting with its agenda; each conversation with its urgent need for relevancy—that one faces a gathering which is not going to end in a vote with a sense of emptiness. For it takes a wise man and the long habit of contemplation to spin threads from one's own inwards. The rest of us can only splice those odd fragments of conclusion which this unaccustomed effort produces.

The first task is repression. One who has been serving in the field of foreign affairs must beware at a moment like this of those "pernicious abstractions", in the Lincolnian phrase, which rise in the heart and gather to the eyes—albeit only the mind's eyes. Sovereignty, security—in a curious way so many of them begin with "s"—selfishness, survival, sacrifice, self-executing; society, social significance, and suicide. The "inters" also dig a pit for the unwary—interdependent, international, inextricably intermingled. We turn to them from an almost biological urge to stretch from where we are to somewhere brighter, like a sprout coming through the earth. But speeches in which they appear usually portray a mood rather than a thought, and are apt to end with a paraphrase of the closing sentence of the Gettysburg address.

If one is to spin from his own visceral wisdom, he must say, first, "I shall not be a fake"; and, second, "What do I know, or think I know, from my own experience and not by literary osmosis?" An honest answer would be "Not much; and I am not too sure of most of it."

One thing, however, seems pretty sure—that the tasks which grow out of the relations of our country with other countries are hard ones. This does not come from any lack of ideas and suggestions. These pour out on the unhappy laborer in this vineyard in a generous, if varied, flood. Mr. Morrow remarked that there were two classes

of people: those who talked about things, and those who did things. And he added that the competition in the second group was not keen.

No, the difficulty does not come from any meagerness of choice of direction or method. It comes pretty directly from the medium with which one works, the human animal himself. Senator Barkley observes resignedly from time to time that one man has about as much human nature as another—and perhaps a little more. And so, when we tackle the fundamental task in the conduct of our foreign affairs, which Mr. Hull has described as focusing the will of 140,000,000 people on problems beyond our shores, we find ourselves in trouble. The trouble comes from the fact that people are focusing on 140,000,000 other things—or, more accurately, not focusing on them, but getting very much mixed up with and about them—and the people in other countries are doing the same thing.

The reasons why this is so lie beyond the limits of my knowledge and so talk about them is banned by my self-restraining ordinance. But there is one contributing factor which I have observed and believe causes an immense amount of trouble. Man has been poking about within his own mind and has found out too much about it for his own wisdom to handle.

For a long time we have gone along with some well-tested principles of conduct: that it was better to tell the truth than falsehoods; that a half truth was no truth at all; that duties were older than and as fundamental as rights; that, as Justice Holmes put it, the mode by which the inevitable came to pass was effort; that to perpetrate a harm was always wrong no matter how many joined in it, but to perpetrate it on a weaker person or people was particularly detestable; and so on.

Our institutions are founded on the assumption that most people follow these principles most of

¹ An address delivered before the Associated Harvard Clubs in Boston, Mass., on June 4 and released to the press on the same date.

the time because they want to, and the institutions work pretty well when this assumption is true. More recently, however, bright people have been fooling with the machinery in the human head and they have discovered quite a lot. For instance, we know that association and repetition play a large part in the implanting of ideas. This has unexpected results. We no longer engage in the arduous task of making a better mouse trap to induce the world to beat a path to our door. We associate with our product a comely and exposed damsel, or a continued story which speeds daily through the air rejected only by the ionosphere.

So far the matter does not seem too serious. But when Hitler introduced new refinements they were serious. It appears to be true that people can be united most quickly by hatred of a comparatively weak group in the community and by the common sense of guilt which accompanies outrages against its members. We have had some experience of this ourselves. With this as a start and all the perverted ingenuity of propaganda, which uses familiar and respected words and ideas to implant the exact opposite standard and goal, a whole people have been utterly confused and corrupted. Unhappily neither the possession of this knowledge nor the desire to use it was confined to Hitler.

Others dip from this same devil's cauldron. The politician who knows that notoriety survives the context is anxious to be mentioned as often as possible. The perfect tool at hand is controversy. For controversy is far more diverting than exposition, and, therefore, the press and radio are more than willing to assist. They have been known to pitch some balls of their own. And no controversy is safer than one with the foreigner, the outsider. His defenders at once become suspect. So a field which is difficult enough, where more than anywhere widespread agreement is essential, becomes a peculiar prey to controversy.

There is also the new psychology of crisis—exemplified by the common expression "to build a fire under him". Now in my archaic profession to do that is to commit arson, and the law takes a dim view of it. But abroad and at home it has been observed that to obtain relief from the unendurable produces a quite irrational sense of well-being. Therefore, the unendurable situation is created so that one may profit from the circumstances of relief.

It is, I believe, a Russian fable which recounts the advice given by a priest to a peasant who in-

sisted that he was about to commit suicide because his life was so unbearable. The advice was to move his goats and chickens into his own hut for a week, and then to move them out. The advice, of course, was sound. Life took on a definitely rosier hue and the idea of suicide was abandoned. It is not recommended as a sound practice, like swinging two bats before going to the plate.

The evil is not merely that the perpetrator of the crisis misjudges his own skill and involves us all in disaster, but that, as with all these practices, a Gresham's law of politics and morals sets in. The baser practice drives out the better. The cheaper, the more fantastic, the more adapted to prejudice, the more reckless the appeal or the maneuver, the more attention, and excited attention, it receives. And the less chance there is that we shall listen to the often difficult analysis of the facts and the always difficult consideration of duty.

It is evil for shrewd men to play on the minds and loyalties and fears of their fellows as on an instrument. It produces not only the degradation of the democratic dogma about which Brooks Adams warned, but the degradation of all mankind everywhere, paralyzing the very centers of moral action, until these oceans of cunning words wash through the minds of men like the sea through the empty portholes of a derelict.

If the need for a remedy seems urgent, it might be sought both through attaining an intellectual immunity to this virus by identifying and isolating it and also by making it plain to its carriers at home and abroad by the plainest words and acts that they are not fit company for morally healthy people.

These practices, I said a moment ago, seemed to me a contributing factor in the trouble we have in focusing the will of people on problems beyond our shores. Perhaps, even more than this, they have contributed to those problems. If it is true, as I believe it is, that the continued moral, military, and economic power of the United States is an essential factor in the organization of peace, then these matters about which we have been talking have greatly contributed to our troubles. They lie at the root of the hysteria which has wrought such havoc with our armed services, and continues to do so. They lie at the root, also, of the difficulty which we have in using our great economic power, in our own interest, to hasten recovery in other countries along lines which are essential to our own system. They have contrib-

uted largely to the weakening of our economic strength itself. The slogans "Bring the boys home!" and "Don't be Santa Claus!" are not among our more gifted or thoughtful contributions to the creation of a free and tranquil world.

This seems to me true for the simplest of all reasons, which is that the sensible way to strengthen a structure is not to weaken its most essential parts. I am often told that the way to solve this or that problem is to leave it to the United Nations. But it seems to me inescapable that if they are, or we hope will be, united, they are still nations; and no more can be expected of this forum for political adjustment than the sum total of the contributions. If these are wise and steadfast and supported by strength determined to organize peace, the results will be good. But, in the Arab proverb, the ass that went to Mecca remained an ass, and a policy has little added to it by its place of utterance.

So, when one sees our military forces disrupted, one is entitled to ask whether the considerations which led to this were more valid and urgent than the sense of steadiness and confidence which our forces gave and would have continued to give to millions all over a badly shattered and uncertain world. The answer which one most often gets does not go to the merits of the question. It goes to another of our devices for finding out what we think—opinion polls. It appears that we have become extroverts, if of a somewhat hypochondriac type, and ascertain our state of health by this mass temperature taking. Fortunately this was not one of the hardships of Valley Forge.

So, too, those who must labor daily at the crossings where the lives of many people meet understand better than they can expound that their tasks can be lightened but not performed by a resolution drafted and passed at Hunter College. These tasks are more deeply affected by how we and others master the intricacies of the production and movement of food and other goods, by how successfully we deal with labor problems and inflation, with credits, with the wise use of natural resources. They even involve the most national of all problems—the efficiency of the administrative and legislative processes.

At this point I am aware of voices which say that national sovereignty is the root of the whole trouble and that we must do away with all of that. It may be so, but to a sinking heart there comes the admonition of Old Hickory at the battle of

New Orleans, apocryphally reported by Paul Porter: "Boys, elevate them guns a little lower." It may be that the way to solve a difficult problem is to transfer one's attention to an insoluble one. But I doubt it.

Rather it seems to me the path of hope is toward the concrete, toward the manageable, in the first instance. A forum there should be, and there is, for the adjustment, as best we can, of those critical issues which threaten the peace. But when we come to tasks of common management, it seems wise to start with those which through hard and intelligent work can be reduced to manageable dimensions and governed by pretty specific rules and standards—like the monetary fund, the bank, the trade organization, and, if possible, the control of atomic energy. These are hard enough in all conscience. I have chewed on them and know their toughness and the frailty of the task forces and their plans. But the jobs are doable with good sense and good luck.

To do these jobs and conduct our own affairs with passable restraint and judgment—the type of judgment, as Justice Brandeis used to say, which leads a man not to stand in front of a locomotive—will be an achievement. Moreover, it will be an achievement which will profoundly modify many situations which now concern us, including—and I am now guessing—our relations with the Soviet Union. Problems which are difficult against a background of confusion, hesitation, and disintegration may well become quite possible of solution as national and international institutions and activities become healthy and confident and vigorous in a large part of the world. Certainly our troubles will not increase.

But it is a long and tough job and one for which we as a people are not particularly suited. We believe that any problem can be solved with a little ingenuity and without inconvenience to the folks at large. We have trouble-shooters to do this. And our name for problems is significant. We call them headaches. You take a powder and they are gone. These pains about which we have been talking are not like that. They are like the pain of earning a living. They will stay with us until death. We have got to understand that all our lives the danger, the uncertainty, the need for alertness, for effort, for discipline will be upon us. This is new to us. It will be hard for us. But we are in for it and the only real question is whether we shall know it soon enough.

Rumanian Reply to U. S. Note on General Elections and Public Liberties

[Released to the press June 7]

The following note from the Rumanian Minister for Foreign Affairs was received by the United States representative in Bucharest on June 3, 1946 and has now been released for publication by the Rumanian Government:

SIR:

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note dated May the twenty-seventh and at the same time to forward you the Rumanian Government's reply thereto.

From the contents of your note it follows that the anxiety expressed by the United States Government is caused, first, by the non-fixation of the date for the general elections and, secondly, by the manner in which the Moscow decisions concerning public liberties are being carried out.

The Rumanian Government are eager to effect the general elections as speedily as possible. To this end they have, after laborious study, set up the provisional draft of the electoral law, which they have submitted to public discussion, in their desire to win the assent of the entire public opinion to the final wording of that law. After the law's promulgation the Government will proceed without delay to the establishing of the electoral lists and then, after that procedure will have been accomplished, they will consult the electorate. With regard to the public liberties, guaranteed by the Moscow decisions, the Rumanian Government have taken all measures to ensure their exercise.

The Rumanian Government wish to implement the Moscow decisions in their entirety, yet with constant mindfulness to defend the rule of public order and security necessary for the fulfillment of the obligations which they have assumed under the Armistice Agreement as well as for the realization of the commandments of the States' permanent interests.

At present the opposition parties have at their disposal 16 newspapers, wherein the free expression of opinion is complete, bordering as it does on license, through their violence of language. On February the twenty-second last, the President of the Council of Ministers, wishing to take cognizance personally of the complaints of the press, called a conference of representatives of all news-

papers in the country, including opposition newspapers. No complaint whatever was raised at that conference by the representatives of the opposition newspapers in connection with the action of the services of censorship. The directives of the Allied Control Commission aiming to prevent the diffusion of polemics between the Allies have but rarely been applied to certain statements from abroad.

According to regulations in force, broadcasting facilities are and remain available only to persons with official responsibilities in the performance of their governmental or administrative duties, yet not to persons without responsibility.

The political violence which at times manifests itself at public meetings and demonstrations is due, for the most part, to the campaigns of agitation and hatred that have been launched lately by the opposition parties against the Government and its members, and the responsible authorities are making all efforts to hamper it and to maintain public order and tranquillity.

The legal proceedings against the authors of the incidents of November 8 have been continued only in regard to those who, at the time of the governmental statement, were under inquiry for offense against common law and were found in a position of obvious and legally ascertained guilt, as the application of the law cannot be suspended in favor of any citizen.

The ministers representing the National Liberal Party under the leadership of Mr. Dinu Bratianu and the National Peasant Party under the leadership of Mr. Iulius Maniu have participated and are still participating in all cabinet meetings, where they mean, however, to exercise, according to their initial statements, only the function of observers, not that of collaborators.

Thus the impressions abroad, to which your note refers, can only be the consequence of a certain propaganda that aims to misrepresent the acts of the Government and to ignore realities in our country.

Very truly yours,

G. TATARESCU

*Vice President of the Council of Ministers,
Minister for Foreign Affairs.*

Treaty Obligations and Philippine Independence

EXCHANGE OF NOTES BETWEEN THE U. S. AND BOLIVIAN GOVERNMENTS

EXCELLENCY:

With reference to the forthcoming independence of the Philippines on July 4, 1946, my Government considers that provision for a transitional period for dealing with the special tariff position which Philippine products have occupied for many years in the United States is an essential accompaniment to Philippine independence. Accordingly, under the Philippine Trade Act approved April 30, 1946, goods the growth, produce or manufacture of the Philippines will enter the United States free of duty until 1954, after which they will be subject to gradually and regularly increasing rates of duty or decreasing duty-free quotas until 1974 when general rates will become applicable and all preferences will be completely eliminated.

Since the enactment of the Philippine Independence Act approved March 24, 1934, my Government has foreseen the probable necessity of providing for such a transitional period and has since then consistently excepted from most-favored-nation obligations which it has undertaken toward foreign governments advantages which it might continue to accord to Philippine products after the proclamation of Philippine independence. Some thirty instruments in force with other governments, for example, permit the continuation of the exceptional tariff treatment now accorded by my Government to Philippine products, irrespective of the forthcoming change in the Commonwealth's political status.

With a view, therefore, to placing the relations between the United States and Bolivia upon the same basis, with respect to the matters involved, as the relations existing under the treaties and agreements referred to in the preceding paragraph, I have the honor to propose that the most-favored-nation provisions of the treaty of Peace, Friend-

ship, Commerce and Navigation between the United States and Bolivia signed May 13, 1858, shall not be understood to require the extension to Bolivia of advantages accorded by the United States to the Philippines.

In view of the imminence of the inauguration of an independent Philippine Government, I should be glad to have the reply of Your Excellency's Government to this proposal at an early date.

Accept [etc.]

DEAN ACHESON
Acting Secretary of State

EMBAJADA DE BOLIVIA

Washington

EXCELLENCY:

I have the honor to refer to Your Excellency's note of May 4, 1946, with regard to the provision that the most favored nation clause of the Treaty of Peace, Friendship, Commerce and Navigation between the United States and Bolivia, signed May 13, 1858, shall not be understood to require the extension to Bolivia of advantages accorded by the United States to the Philippines.

In appreciation of the facts explained in Your Excellency's note, and as an act of friendship to the Philippine Nation in the achieving its independence, I have the honor to express, on behalf of the Bolivian Government, the acceptance of this proposition.

Accept [etc.]

V ANDRADE
Washington, D. C., June 10, 1946

His Excellency

Mr. JAMES F. BYRNES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

Mission To Observe Revision of Greek Electoral Lists

The United States Government has accepted an invitation of the Greek Government to observe a revision of the Greek electoral lists preparatory to the plebiscite scheduled in Greece for September 1 on the question of the return of King George II. The report of the Allied Mission which observed the Greek elections on March 31 had recommended that before any national question was again submitted to the people a complete revision of registration lists be made.

The United States delegation will consist of about 50 to 60 people, a number of whom were in the United States delegation which assisted in observing the March 31 elections.

It was pointed out that the United States delegation will not participate in any manner in the plebiscite. Its sole function is to assist in the revision of voting lists which have not been revised since 1936.

Letters of Credence

Ambassador of the U. S. S. R.

The newly appointed Ambassador of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Nikolai Vasilievich Novikov, presented his letters of credence to the President on June 3. For the texts of the Ambassador's remarks and the President's reply, see Department of State press release 378.

Ambassador of Haiti

The newly appointed Ambassador of Haiti, Dantes Bellegarde, presented his letters of credence to the President on June 3. For the texts of the Ambassador's remarks and the President's reply, see Department of State press release 379.

Ambassador of Great Britain

The newly appointed British Ambassador, Lord Inverchapel, presented his letters of credence to the President on June 5. For the texts of the Ambassador's remarks and the President's reply, see Department of State press release 385.

Signing of Military Mission Agreement With Venezuela

[Released to the press June 3]

In conformity with the request of the Government of Venezuela, there was signed on Monday, June 3, 1946, by James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State, and A. Machado-Hernández, Ambassador of Venezuela in Washington, an agreement providing for the detail of a military mission by the United States to serve in Venezuela.

The agreement will continue in force for two years from the date of signature, but may be extended beyond that period at the request of the Government of Venezuela.

The agreement contains provisions similar in general to provisions contained in agreements between the United States and certain other American republics providing for the detail of officers of the United States Army or Navy to advise the armed forces of those countries.

GERMAN DOCUMENTS—Continued from page 1041.

threat arising from that vast expanse, either as a consequence of its political philosophy or of a military nature. That our countries together, in pursuance of the Anti-Comintern policy hitherto carried on by them in common, can give the decisive blow for the elimination of Bolshevism, that greatest enemy of mankind, will be for both our peoples and their leaders the classic justification of their common political ideas, and their greatest claim to eternal fame.

In addition, I believe that the defeat of Russia will materially hasten the conquest of England by the Axis powers. Thereby there will be provided the prerequisites for the New Order in Europe and East Asia so desired by both our peoples, and no one in the world will be able to dispute any longer the right of the states united in the Three Power Pact and now more closely joined than ever in their struggle in Bolshevism, to set up a new and just world order.

RIBBENTROP."

End of telegram.

RIBBENTROP

Philippine Independence Day Ceremonies

[Released to the press June 7]

On July 4, 1946 the ceremonies attending the proclamation of the independence of the Republic of the Philippines and the inauguration of the President and Vice President will take place in Manila. The ceremonies are under the joint auspices of the Government of the United States and the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines. Invitations to be represented at the Independence Day ceremonies have been extended jointly to all governments with which the United States maintains diplomatic relations.

Transit Use of Azores Airports

[Released to the press June 4]

Under a wartime agreement made with the Portuguese Government on November 28, 1944 the United States and Portugal constructed on Santa Maria Island in the Azores a modern and complete airport which played an important role during World War II. With the expiration of this wartime agreement the airport has been returned to the Portuguese Government for conversion to peacetime uses. Meanwhile, however, the United States will be permitted the continued transit use of airports in the Azores for 18 months to maintain lines of communication with its occupation forces in Germany and Japan.

SELECTIVE SERVICE—Continued from page 1037.

ceeded at Government expense to report for induction at the particular installation named in the induction order. In the latter cases, transportation arrangements were made by Department of State representatives at the expense of the Selective Service System.

Those who returned to the United States for induction or who enlisted in the service branch of their own choice apparently did so for a number of reasons, such as preference relative to place where basic training was expected to be received, opportunity to visit home before entering service, and opportunity to transport the family to the United States at the employer's expense.

A registrant appearing at the designated armed-forces installation outside the United States for induction is either (a) accepted and retained by the armed forces, or (b) rejected and returned to his home at the expense of the branch of the armed forces concerned. If he fails to appear according to the DSS Form 150-F, the armed-forces commanding officer returns the papers to the War or Navy Department, as the case may be, with a notation showing registrant's failure to appear in order that his case may be processed under the regulations relating to delinquency.

If the registrant chooses to return to his home in the United States, it is his duty to report immediately to the local board of jurisdiction, which is instructed by general directive to proceed immediately with his induction.

Although the record is, of course, still far from complete, it is apparent from the figures given above that the final total of men entering the armed forces as a result of the extension of Selective Service to Americans in foreign countries will be small in relation to Selective Service operations in the United States, which have resulted in the induction of about 12,000,000 men. The fact that the manpower yield of the operation in foreign countries would be relatively small was realized from the beginning. The significance of the operation and the justification for the effort have lain not in numbers but in the underlying principles of fairness which have characterized Selective Service. The mere fact of foreign residence was recognized as constituting no adequate basis for exempting American men living in foreign countries from military service, and the practical problems of reaching these men with a workable system for their registration, classification, and physical examination and induction where required were met and solved through the cooperative efforts of the Selective Service System, the Department of State, and the War and Navy Departments.

In December 1945 Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, wrote the Secretary of State expressing his sincere appreciation of the splendid assistance and cooperation of the Department of State in the registration, physical examination, and induction of American citizens in foreign countries.

Signing of Protocol Modifying the Income-Tax Convention With the United Kingdom

[Released to the press June 6]

On June 6, 1946 there was signed by James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State, and J. Balfour, C.M.G., British Minister in Washington, a supplementary protocol modifying in certain respects the income-tax convention (that is, the convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income) between the United States and the United Kingdom, signed at Washington on April 16, 1945.

The protocol provides that paragraph (3) of article XI of the income-tax convention "shall be deemed to be deleted and of no effect", and that the protocol shall be regarded as an integral part of the convention.

The Senate, on June 1, 1946, gave its advice and consent to ratification of the income-tax convention with the United Kingdom, in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee on Foreign Relations (S. Exec. Rept. 4, 79th Cong., 2d sess., May 10, 1946). However, in the report of the committee reference was made to hearings which were held before a subcommittee, in the course of which hearings interested persons were heard with respect to certain objections which had been raised in regard to paragraph (3) of article XI of the convention. Article XI contains three paragraphs, under the first two of which a reciprocal exemption is accorded by each country, upon certain conditions, with respect to compensation for personal services performed within that country by a resident of the other country. Paragraph (3) specifically excludes public entertainers from the benefits of such exemption.

The subcommittee recommended approval of the convention without amendment, at the same time recommending that appropriate steps be taken with a view to eliminating paragraph (3) of article XI from the convention. The supplementary protocol has been concluded for the latter purpose.

An avenue named in honor of Franklin Delano Roosevelt is now being cut through an important downtown section of Lima, Peru.

The Proclaimed List

[Released to the press June 7]

The Secretary of State, acting in conjunction with the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Commerce, issued on June 7 Cumulative Supplement No. 3 to Revision X of the Proclaimed List of Certain Blocked Nationals.

Part I of Cumulative Supplement No. 3 contains three additional listings in the other American republics and 60 deletions; Part II contains 35 additional listings outside the American republics and 51 deletions.

Representative on Commission on Narcotic Drugs

The Senate confirmed on June 6 the nomination of Harry J. Anslinger as United States representative on the Commission on Narcotic Drugs of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

WIESMAN—Continued from page 1034.

for the most part become historic milestones already passed by the vast majority of ILO members.

In seeking language to set forth the principles and purposes of the ILO, the Working Party concluded that the Declaration of Philadelphia unanimously adopted there on May 10, 1944 is an ideal statement of these objectives. It was decided that reference to the Declaration of Philadelphia should be incorporated in the preamble and that the declaration itself should be annexed to the constitution, while original objectives of the preamble and of article 41 would be deleted.

At the same time the Working Party report seeks to make it clear that the functions attributed to the International Labor Organization by the terms of the Declaration of Philadelphia differ in character from the coordinating responsibilities which have been entrusted to the Economic and Social Council by the Charter of the United Nations and have been designed from the outset to be exercised within a wider framework of coordinated effort to attain "better standards of life in larger freedom."

Visit of Haitian Economist

Francis Salgado, a distinguished lawyer and political economist and chairman of the Inter-American Commercial Arbitration Commission in Haiti, is visiting the United States at the invitation of the Department of State. He purposes to confer with colleagues in the field of economics and to study the past economic relations between Haiti and the United States and the possible development and improvement of future relations.

As a specialist in political economy and finance he is prepared to lecture in American universities on either political economy, finance, or sociology, and thus to promote a better understanding between Haiti and the United States.

Mr. Salgado will remain approximately six weeks in Washington, D. C., and then will visit universities in the northeast section of the United States.

HOWARD—Continued from page 1027.

of monetary gold. This method of distribution was chosen because the losses of gold, amounting to over a half billion dollars, were far in excess of the gold recovered, and because the gold recovered was for the most part not identifiable. As a part of the agreement with Switzerland referred to, Switzerland has agreed to make available to the "gold pot" \$58.1 million of gold, in recognition of the large amounts of gold she received from Germany during the war.

8. The Paris Conference adopted a unanimous resolution that, in the administration of benefits for war damage to property, each government shall in principle accord to the nationals of all the other participating governments treatment not less favorable than that accorded to its own nationals. The important undertaking contained in this resolution will help to assure non-discriminatory treatment of United States and other foreign nationals in the administration of compensation benefits by all the nations which participated in the conference.

III

The agreements reached by the Paris Conference were achieved in a remarkable spirit of cooperation and good-will. On a number of occasions during the 42 meetings and 6 weeks of con-

tinuous discussion, conflicts of interests threatened the Conference with disunity and even complete dissolution. Nevertheless, out of the desire of every delegate to reach agreement, conflicts were overcome through compromise, and an exceptional atmosphere of mutual understanding and common sense developed which prevailed during even the most serious crises and finally led the Conference to success.

Informal discussions were held by the American, British, and French delegates to the Conference, both in advance of and during the conference, in order to obtain preliminary agreement on as many points as possible. Through these discussions it was possible to provide general guidance to the work of the conference itself. At the same time there was full participation by all 18 delegates in the initiation of proposals, in the drafting of final resolutions, and in the discussions of the conference. Unanimous agreement was sought on every point within the competence of the conference. With respect to matters within the competence of the Control Council for Germany, a number of non-unanimous resolutions were adopted by delegates who desired to adhere, and the delegates of the occupying powers undertook to bring these to the notice of their respective governments.

The Congress

Study of International Communications: Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, United States Senate, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, pursuant to S. Res. 187 (78th Congress) (Extended by S. Res. 24—79th Congress), a resolution directing a study of international communications by wire and radio. Part 2. Exhibits submitted by Federal Communications Commission, March 19—April 3, 1945. iii, 330 pp.

Atomic Energy Act of 1946: Hearings Before the Special Committee on Atomic Energy, United States Senate, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, on S. 1717, a bill for the development and control of atomic energy. Part 4. February 18, 19, and 27, 1946. iii, 70 pp.

Administrative Expenses in Government Departments. H. Rept. 2186, 79th Cong., to accompany H.R. 6533. 24 pp. [Favorable report.]

Providing Support for Wool, Amending the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, and Providing for Wool Standards, and for Other Purposes. S. Rept. 1398, 79th Cong., to accompany S. 2033. 18 pp. [Favorable report.]

The Foreign Service

Confirmations

On June 5 the Senate confirmed the nomination of Charles Ulrick Bay to be American Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Norway.

Consular Offices

The American Consulate General at Gdansk, Poland, was established on May 7, 1946.

The status of the American Consulate at Saigon, French Indochina, was changed to that of Consulate General on May 23, 1946.

The American Vice Consulate at Manáos, Brazil, was closed to the public on May 31, 1946.

The Consulate at Turin, Italy, was opened to the public on June 1, 1946.

The Department

Resignation of George P. Baker

George P. Baker resigned as Director of the Office of Transport and Communications Policy, effective June 30. For the texts of Mr. Baker's letter of June 4 and Assistant Secretary Clayton's letter of June 7 accepting the resignation, see Department of State press release 394 of June 8, 1946.

Appointment of Officers

William T. Stone, Director of the State Department's Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs, on June 6 announced the appointment of Kenneth D. Fry as Acting Chief of OIC's International Broadcasting Division. Mr. Fry had been Acting Associate Chief in charge of the San Francisco office.

Training Announcements

Orientation Conferences

Departmental Series

General John H. Hildring, Assistant Secretary of State for occupied areas, will speak on "American Policies in Occupied Areas" Wednesday, June 26, at 10 a.m.

Foreign Service Training Series

Mr. John B. Appleton will present an "Introduction to India and the Far East" on Wednesday, June 26, at 9 a.m. Mr. Appleton is the Geographic Adviser to the Division of Far East Intelligence (FEI). These lectures will be held in Room 474, main State Department building.

Agricultural Missions

The Division of Training Services has been arranging orientation conferences in the Department for personnel of two American agricultural missions which are going to China and the Philippines, respectively, under the joint auspices of the Department of State and the Department of Agriculture. The missions were requested by the Chinese and Philippine Governments.

The nine-man mission to China, headed by Dr. Claude B. Hutchison, dean of the College of Agriculture and vice-president of the University of California, will leave Washington on June 27. The five-man mission to the Philippines, headed by Dean Leland E. Call, director, Agricultural Experiment Station, Kansas State College, was to leave June 20.

During their stay in Washington the members of the two missions have been making an intensive study of American policies in the Far East and of American trade relations with China and the Philippines.

Upon arrival at their respective destinations, the American personnel of the two missions will be joined by Chinese and Philippine agricultural experts. After studying the possibilities of improving the agricultural economies of the two countries, the joint missions will make recommendations to the Governments at Nanking and Manila.

The missions were organized through the efforts of the Interdepartmental Committee on Cultural and Scientific Cooperation, working with the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations of the Department of Agriculture.